A Challenge To All Genuine Skeptics From A Holocaust Revisionist

infotextmanuscripts.org/challenge_to_skeptics.html

This is a challenge to all genuine skeptics who, unlike Michael Shermer, are prepared to confront Holocaust Revisionism with both an open mind and objectivity.

A brief introduction is necessary; my name is Alexander Baron, I have been a Holocaust skeptic for a shade over thirty years, and a dedicated Revisionist since the 1990s. I have published two full length books on the so-called Holocaust, both of which can be downloaded free from this website. (1) I have also published a number of pamphlets and articles from a pro-Revisionist perspective. (2)

Eleven years ago I published a critique of Michael Shermer's methodology, to which he did not deign to respond, or if he did, I didn't hear about it. In my critique I alluded to the testimony of the Polish Jewess Sophia Litwinska regarding the alleged homicidal gas chamber at Auschwitz. This short dissertation is concerned both with her testimony and the evidence of another Jewess, Regina Bialek. It is my belief that any honest skeptic who confronts the testimony of these two vitally important witnesses will of necessity develop serious doubts about the existence of both the alleged Nazi extermination programme, and the veracity of all the claims made by other witnesses concerning the use of homicidal gas chambers to exterminate people *en masse* in any of the alleged Nazi extermination camps.

As confirmed skeptics I ask you to respond only with rational, clearly thought out, and logical arguments. *Ad hominem* attacks, appeals to authority or to emotion, hysteria, innuedo, name calling, righteous indignation, shaming language, smears with guilt by association, or simple ridicule, do not constitute rational argument, and are no substitute for it.

If you are able to refute the arguments I advance here, I await your response. If however you are not able to refute them, then common decency not to mention your professed commitment to historical and scientific truth demand that you acknowledge both that I am right, and that Shermer is wrong.

At the four links immediately below you will find four PDF files; these contain two documents. I had intended to combine them into one, but the smaller sizes make them easier to load, and you will if you wish be able to view two or more pages simultaneously easily with this layout.

****

WO 235/13, page 169
WO 235/13, page 172
WO 235/14, page 108
WO 235/14, page 109

****

These documents are from the first Belsen Trial. More specifically they are scans of photocopies of original documents; both the photocopies and the scans thereof were made by me. The originals are deposited with the Public Record Office at Kew (the National Archives it is now to be called). I copied these documents in the 1990s but only got round to scanning them much more recently.

There is a £40 fee for publishing such original documents on-line; On March 1, 2011, I paid that fee. (3) I needn't have bothered because the entire transcript had already been published on-line at http://www.bergenbelsen.co.uk/ (4)

But I decided to go ahead and publish these documents because a neatly processed HTML transcript is no substitute for the real thing.

Now, some background. Although it was not the first trial of alleged Nazi war criminals, nor even the first trial of concentration camp staff, it was and remains one of the most important. In spite of its name, the Belsen Trial was concerned not simply with the trial of staff who had served at Belsen, but also with those who had served at Auschwitz. Some of the defendants had served at both camps; for example, Josef Kramer, had been Commandant of Auschwitz-Birkenau prior to his transfer to Belsen.

Due partly to this, but also in large part to both sloppy journalists and cynical propagandists, there has been and continues to be a great deal of confusion about both Belsen camp and this trial over the decades since the end of World War Two. It should though be stressed here that it has never been claimed by serious historians and chroniclers that Belsen was any sort of extermination camp, although emotive photographs of its burial pits and emaciated victims continue to be used as unique proof of both white wickedness and of the evils of some nebulous ideology known as *racism*. And of Nazi anti-Semitism, of course.

I stress again that I am not concerned here with Belsen, or with *racism*, or indeed even with Nazism, but only with the existence or otherwise of homicidal gas chambers in the Auschwitz camp, and by implication, in other alleged Nazi extermination camps.

If you read about Holocaust Revisionism in the mainstream media, and certainly if you read about it from Jewish sources, or even in scholarly books and journals written by accredited academics, you will find it is greeted with anger, cynicism, dismay, horror, outrage, ridicule, satire, indeed with all manner of negative emotions. This hasn't always been the case; for many years, decades, there was no comment on the Revisionists at all; in short, they were given the silent treatment. Since about 1974 this has not been

possible, and of course with the rise of the Internet, the total suppression of any idea, ideology or publication has become virtually impossible, even if same is considered anathema by the overwhelming majority of the population.

Holocaust Revisionists have therefore been subjected to all the above tirades. To these should be added both legal persecution in some jurisdictions, and occasionally by illegal persecution, including naked violence.

In December 2006, an international conference was held into the veracity of the Holocaust and the claims of the Revisionists. This took place in Tehran, the capital of Iran, a country whose régime is treated with scorn and disdain by the Western media and by much of the Western political establishment. Iran's charismatic leader, President Ahmadinejad pointed out that in the West, it is possible to deny the existence of the Prophet Muhammad, or even of God himself, but "...if someone were to deny the myth of the Jews' massacre, all the Zionist mouthpieces and the governments subservient to the Zionists tear their larynxes and scream against the person as much as they can." (5)

Whether or not you agree with the Revisionists, whether or not you like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, it is difficult to take issue with this claim.

Although Revisionists have come to accept these reactions from the mass media and academia, some of us have been extremely disappointed by the reaction of the Skeptics Movement, which has been basically to parrot the establishment line. Those skeptics who deign to mention us at all usually allude to us as Holocaust Deniers – the epithet popularised by Deborah E. Lipstadt, an academic who is so confident of her position that she will not even debate Revisionists – because in her arrogant opinion there is no debate – in other words, everyone – including you – must take what *she* says as Gospel.

Some skeptics compare us with flat-Earthers or with people who believe in flying saucers. This is truly ironic, because while they reject all evidence of flying saucers, these same people accept all evidence relating to the Holocaust for exactly the same reasons: there are numerous witnesses, documents, physical evidence, and surely the whole world can't be wrong, can it?

I think it is fair to say that only one skeptic, certainly one prominent skeptic, has even dared to look at the evidence and arguments adduced by the Revisionists, the aforementioned Michael Shermer, and what a shamefully pitiful effort he has made. (6)

I do not propose here to document the numerous proven lies about the Holocaust that have been and continue to be perpetuated by both the mass media, and by certain Jewish organisations. I and others have done this elsewhere, and I would refer you in the first instance to my aforementioned books on the so-called Holocaust. (1)

As stated, I propose to focus solely on one particular lie – that of the mass gassings that were said to have taken place at Auschwitz-Birkenau. I mentioned flying saucers above. Would it surprise you if I were to say that I could make out a stronger case for the

existence of flying saucers than can Michael Shermer and his chum Alex Grobman for mass gassings at Auschwitz? Okay, here goes:

It has been reliably estimated that there are somewhere in the region of seventy sextillion stars in the Universe, every one of them is a sun like our own. The Sun is approximately 4.6 billion years old; the Universe is over 13 billion years old.

At the time of writing, over five hundred exoplanets have been detected, including a new solar system. Though we are in the realm of speculation, it is intelligent speculation nevertheless that there are countless stars which have planets similar to our own Earth on which life may have evolved. Leaving aside God, it is possible that the "purpose" of the Universe is to create life.

If life is abundant throughout the Universe, and if intelligent life evolves naturally in a tiny fraction of these instances, it is possible, indeed likely, that there are thousands or even millions of civilisations "out there" somewhere, and that many of them are far more advanced than ours. It is therefore possible that some of these civilisations have developed technologies far superior to ours, and that some have managed to bridge the gaps between stars, or even galaxies, and that some have visited this planet but for whatever reason have chosen merely to observe us without initiating contact.

All that is possible. The alternative hypothesis is of necessity that Man is alone in the Universe, with whatever implications, spiritual or metaphysical, that has.

What is not possible is the testimony of Litwinska. What is also not possible is the evidence of Bialek.

First the deposition of Regina Bialek, please refer in particular to the document belsen-trial-wo-235-14-108.pdf at paragraph 3 where she claims she was sent to the gas chamber on Christmas Day, 1943. Bialek says there were seven gas chambers in Auschwitz, although she does not reveal how she knew about the existence of this supposedly top secret extermination programme. What she thought she knew, surmised or was told is not important; what is important is her testimony as documented here.

Bialek describes in graphic detail how she was deposited in this alleged gas chamber, how when the room was full, a hissing sound was heard to come from the floor, and after she had been in this gas chamber for ten minutes, people's faces began turning blue, they foamed at their mouths, and their faces began to bleed. In most testimonies – the ludicrous nonsense of Kitty Hart, for example, the gas pellets are thrown in through a hole in the roof.

Then, a miracle happens, Dr Mengele – the Angel of Death himself – calls out her name, and she is led from the gas chamber. Just like that!

The testimony of Litwinska is even more remarkable, and this was not a mere affidavit but actual court testimony. Again, she is in the gas chamber in the process of being gassed, when she too hears her name called, and she is taken out of the gas chamber by SS Man

Hoessler, put on his motorbike and taken to the hospital, where she spends six weeks recovering.

Litwinska said when she was in the chamber, the gas made her cough, tears streamed from her eyes, and she felt as though she would be asphyxiated.

These testimonies are incredible, but they are not simply incredible, they are physically impossible. In her 1925 book *INDUSTRIAL POISONS IN THE UNITED STATES*, Alice Hamilton writes of Zyklon B – the alleged killing agent – that "The indiscriminate use of this very dangerous gas by persons quite unfamiliar with it led to the accidental death in Cleveland of four persons who inhaled hydrocyanic acid gas with which a restaurant under their apartment was being fumigated".

Zyklon B rises, which is presumably why it was said – in the case of Bialek – to have come up through the floor.

Even more incredible in the case of Litwinska, because as stated, this testimony was given in open court, and was not substantially challenged, not because – as some Revisionists allege – this was a show trial, but because at that time no defendant or defence counsel thought to ask the right questions, for which they can hardly be blamed considering the conditions under which this – and other so-called war crimes trials – were held. (7) Also, most defendants thought it best not to question the veracity of the allegations but to pass the buck.

For whatever reason, SS Man Hoessler didn't give credence to Litwinska's ludicrous claim about him saving her life, but he did seize the opportunity to paint himself as a good guy – which he may well have been.

When he took the stand, he responded: "…it was someone else whom I took out from the gas chamber. Those who had been selected were in trucks and went down in the direction of the crematorium. I was on the road when one of these trucks passed by, and I saw a woman whom I recognized in the back of the truck. Suddenly two women came and implored me to save her. I saw a motor cyclist near the block facing me, and I told him to go and fetch the woman and take her to the hospital, which he did. She had not been inside the gas chamber." (8) Perhaps, unlike Litwinska, he had some basic knowledge of the laws of physics?

Let us not forget that these gas chambers were said to contain hundreds of people. How could Hoessler or anyone have opened the door, gone inside and dragged out Litwinska or anyone else? This is ludicrous, but we have been here before! Back in the 1970s, the courageous Professor Faurisson exposed similar nonsense relating to other testimonies; the resulting uproar is still reverberating around the world to this day.

Now I would like to repeat a statement I quoted in my previous polemic against Shermer. Every skeptic is surely *au fait* with the following quote from the great philosopher David Hume (1711-76); these words were first published in 1748, and are just as relevant today as they were then, perhaps even more so considering the nonsense with which we have

been bombarded since: “...no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous, than the fact, which it endeavours to establish...”

Both the evidence of Bialek and the testimony of Litwinska are indeed miraculous. What they claimed happened cannot have happened the way they claimed it did. This is not to say that apparently miraculous testimony cannot be true. As I pointed out in an earlier work, a young child or a feeble-minded person who witnessed an adept magician apporting an object might testify sincerely to such a materialisation, and then the handkerchief disappearing back into the ether. Indeed, we have probably most of us witnessed similar sleight-of-hand at times. But that will not do here!

Skeptics, genuine skeptics, must find some way of reconciling thes testimonies with the physical process of mass gassing. There are two such testimonies here, but if there had been two thousand or even two million, they would still be unworthy of belief. Unless you want to argue with David Hume! If you cannot reconcile these testimonies with the physical reality of mass gassing, then you must concede that I am right and Shermer is wrong; that the Revisionists are right and the Exterminationists are wrong. That we are right, and the rest of the world is wrong. And, among other things, we demand a sincere and heartfelt apology from all those academics and others who have not only denounced as as cranks, liars etc and *ad nauseam*, but have impugned our motives, and have themselves contributed to the falsification of history.

I will close this dissertation with a few quotes that may put you on the right track in your honest quest for a truthful explanation:

“On one scaffold stood the condemned Sorceresses, a scanty band, and on another the crowd of the reprieved. The repentant heroine, whose confession was read out, stuck at nothing, however wild and improbable. At the Sabbaths they ate children, hashed; and as second course dead wizards dug up from their graves. Toads dance, talk, complain amorously of their mistresses’ untidinesses, and get the Devil to scold them. This latter sees the Witches home with great politeness, lighting the way with the blazing arm of an unbaptised infant...” (9)

Regarding witchcraft, William M. Best commented: “Some of them present the extraordinary spectacle of individuals, not only freely (so far as the absence of physical torture constitutes freedom) confessing themselves guilty of these imaginary offenses, with the minutest details of time and place, but even charging themselves with having, through a demoniacal aid thus avowed, committed repeated murders and other heinous crimes.” (10)

And finally, again, confessions relating to physically impossible crimes: Issobell Gowdie confessed to renouncing her baptism to the Devil and being baptised in his name. She said she had killed more than half a dozen people. She and her accomplices had sexual

relations with the Devil and he was “abler for them sexually than any man could be. His members were exceeding great and long, but he was as heavy as a sack of malt and as cold as ice.”

She travelled with the Devil in the shape of a cat and a crow, among others. Her confession, which lasted for four days, was entirely voluntary and corroborated by her accomplice, Janet Breadheid, who confirmed her story about killing all the male children of the Laird of Parkis by roasting clay images of them. (11)

Exactly how is copulating with the Devil or riding the night skies with him in the form of a cat any different from the “confession” of Sophia Litwinska that SS Man Hoessler rescued her from a crowded gas chamber after the wicked Nazis had begun administering the Zyklon?

As far as I can see, the only difference between the witch trials in Britain, Salem, et al and the war crimes trials of concentration camp staff is that in Germany at least, it is now a criminal offence to claim these impossible acts did not in fact happen. Shamefully, this sort of legal tyranny has even reared its ugly head in Britain; in October 2008, the Australian scholar Dr Fredrick Töben was arrested at Heathrow Airport and thrown into Wandsworth Prison on a request from the German authorities. He spent several weeks behind bars before the case was dropped.

In this supposedly so enlightened age, the “civilised” West persecutes witches the same way as did Matthew Hopkins, and indicts dissidents in the same way as the Catholic Church once indicted Galieo.

I rest my case.

March 3, 2011

A CHALLENGE TO ALL GENUINE SKEPTICS FROM A HOLOCAUST REVISIONIST: Notes

infotextmanuscripts.org/challenge_to_skeptics_notes.html

(1) My first book on this supposedly so difficult subject can be downloaded from here; and the second from here. These are in compressed Portable Document Format. The uncompressed versions (which are of slightly better quality) can be found here here and here.
(2) See for example *Holocaust Revisionism After Irving Versus Lipstadt*, and the – if I say so myself – hilarious *WHY BRITAIN'S POLICE AREN'T WORTH A JEWISH FINGERNAIL*, which the slime of Organised Jewry tried to ban.
(3) Click here for a PDF of the acknowledgment/receipt.
(4) Due to the transient nature of the Internet, whenever I post an external link, in the first instance I use the archived version (if any) of the site concerned.
(5) This quote can be found all over the Web. The President was speaking in his native Farsi, but unlike the Jewish lie that he threatened to "wipe Israel off the map", it appears to have been reported acccurately right across the board.
(6) Lyle Burkhead has published a detailed, and if I say so myself, truly marvellous critique of Shermer's semantic legerdemain called *Michael Shermer's "Jumping Together" Argument*.
(7) See for example the short memoir written by Major Winwood, who defended Kramer, which can be found here.
(8) Quoted here from *TRIAL OF JOSEF KRAMER AND FORTY-FOUR OTHERS (The Belsen Trial)*, Edited by Raymond Phillips, Foreword by the Right. Hon. Lord Jowitt, published by William Hodge, London, (1949), page 197.
(9) The full citation is *Satanism and Witchcraft: A Study in Medieval Superstition*, by Jules Michelet, Translated by A.R. Allinson, published by Tandem Books, London, (1965), page 115. This is from a chapter on the Basque Witches of 1609 quoting the official Spanish Report of November 9, 1610.
(10) *Why Men Confess*, by O. John Rogge, published by Da Capo Press, New York, (1975), page 55.
(11) Rogge, *Why Men Confess*, (ibid), see pages 55-7 & 58.